DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 863 HE 005 463

AUTHOR Bailey, Robert L.
TITLE Statewide Uniformity From the Capitol.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Records; *Admission (School); Colleges; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; School Registration; *School Services; *State Boards of Education; Universities

ABSTRACT

This study of voluntary and/or mandatory coordination of academic services (admissions, registration, and records) between institutions of higher education and statewide higher education boards provides information concerning the effect that these state agencies have on institutional academic administration and management information systems. Emphasis is placed on: (1) school relations and student recruitment, (2) uniform applications for admission, (3) uniform residence requirements, (4) uniform admission requirements, (5) uniform academic calendar, (6) standarized student information system, and (7) single fee schedules. Conclusions indicate (1) There seems to be very little diversity and distribution across the programs and activities that does not speak favorably for the coordinating agencies relating to full programs and planning. There seems to be an emphasis only on the admission and registration programs. (2) The program, Academic Services Analysis, appeared to be overemphasized in the responses. This may be explained by the fact that student information gathered and maintained about their other programs is often reflected under the reporting procedures of the ASA program. (Author/MJM)

ED 090863

Statewide Uniformity from the Capitol

Robert L. Bailey

Admissions Officer & Registrar

University of California, Berkeley

April 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Tables and Summaries by
Ellen Maldonado Chase
Administrative Internship Program
University of California, Berkeley

HE 005 463

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Description	Page
Introduction	Purpose of the Study	1
I	Survey Instrument Design/Method	3
II	Results and Implications	5
III	Tables I - IX	
IV	Narrative Summary of Open-ended Questions	16
V	Appendix	27

Introduction

The purpose of this study of voluntary and/or mandatory coordination of academic services (admissions, registration and records) between institutions of higher education and statewide higher education boards is to provide input to administrators in higher education at all levels so that there is an awareness in the academic community of the effect that these state agencies have on institutional academic administration and management information systems.

A secondary purpose of the study is to provide a focus point for discussion at the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers' (AACRAO) 1974 annual conference. This concerns a program designed for those Admissions and Records personnel who for their institution have the external coordination responsibilities under a statewide system of higher education of the academic services functions. These institutions are primarily public, but in some states this would include private institutions. The program will deal with such academic services as:

1. school relations and student recruitment
2. uniform applications for admissions
3. uniform residence requirements
4. uniform admission requirements
5. uniform academic calendar
6. standardized student information system
7. single fee schedules

This particular program is sponsored by the Institutional Studies and Operational Analysis Committee of the Data Management and Research Group of AACRAO.

For a number of very good reasons, there is a need to be able to compare similar areas of state higher education between and/or among institutions of higher education so that rational program decisions can be made relative to cost and effectiveness by those agencies held responsible by the citizens of the state for managing higher education. Based on the data presented herein, higher education administrative personnel

can determine first, whether there is a nationwide trend toward coordination of academic services and, second, what the extent of these activities is in particular states. The data can also be used to identify different services that are already in operation so that further comparable information may be obtained relating to program methods, cost and effectiveness.

Survey Instrument Design/Method

Section I:

The method used in obtaining the data was as follows:

Each member of the Committee on Institutional Studies and Operational Analysis was asked in relation to this and another project (organization of an admissions and records primer) to develop a listing of academic services that might be coordinated between institutions of higher education and statewide higher education boards.

The Committee members were:

James R. Schoewer
Director of Institutional Research
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

Robert Cook, Registrar
Eastman School of Music
Rochester, New York

Barbara Schefelbein
Director of Records
Illinois Central College
East Peoria, Illinois

James R. Sehr, Registrar
Indiana University-Southeast
Jeffersonville, Indiana

These independently-perceived listings were reviewed by the writer and collated into one composite list, from which a survey instrument was developed. A draft of the survey instrument was sent to a panel of nationally recognized personnel in the field. This panel includes:

Gene Oliver
School and College Relations
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Charles Lindahl
Coordinator, Admissions Services
California State Universities and Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Gary M. Cooley
Director of Analytical Studies
University of Massachusetts Systems
Boston, Massachusetts
(formerly: State University of New York Systems)

James Morgan, MIS Director
Florida State University Systems
Tallahasse, Florida

A revised survey instrument was produced and field tested. As the results of these tests, a final survey instrument was designed and printed for distribution. The survey instrument was designed with particular care to insure accuracy and ease of response. Though the instrument at first appeared to be rather long, users found that responses required only a check or quick numerical entry, with the exception of the last page, which had provisions for open-ended questions. The first section of the survey instrument asked for general demographic information. In the second section,

agencies were asked to respond to each academic services activity listed. If the activity listed was "not coordinated" or "not coordinated but planned," it was indicated with appropriate response. If the activity was "currently coordinated," then they were asked to indicate if the coordination was "voluntary" or "mandatory."

Using a listing of personnel and addresses of statewide boards of higher education in the October 1973 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, a survey population was identified. This population was used realizing that in many states, the coordinating function is performed by a central administrative office of the University -- SUNY, CUNY, UMASS, The California Systems, etc. -- rather than by an external agency such as a board, coordinating council or commission of higher education, even though these latter agencies may coexist with the former.

The survey instrument was circulated to the statewide higher education boards in fifty (50) states and the District of Columbia. For those states that did not respond within a reasonable period of time, a second survey instrument was sent and a response was requested. Using the completed instruments, a frequency distribution was done for each question by state. In addition, a summary was completed by state of the responses to the open-ended questions, listing a description of specific statewide system activities of institutional academic services functions viewed significant by the state agency. The following statistical computations were completed on all data collected: chi-square; correlation coefficient; mean; standard deviation; variable maximum/minimum and ranges.

Results and Implications

Section II:

The results are shown on the following tables. Section I, Table I reflects identification information relating to statewide boards of higher education that positively responded. Forty-two (42) of fifty-one (51) states responded to the survey. Thirty-nine (39) of the forty-two (42) states that responded completed the survey instrument. As would be expected, those states with large enrollments and strong coordinating agencies had the larger central staff and state budgets. Those states that responded but did not complete the survey instrument reflects reason similar in nature to the state of Nebraska where only one primary public institution exists. Section II, Table II through IX reflect responses to eight major areas of academic administration. These include school relations, admissions, student orientation, financial aids, academic services analysis, registration, records, and former student relations. Section III includes a description of the responses to the open-ended questions.

The major implications of this data will be determined by the state agencies, administrators in higher education and those on the panel at the 1974 annual meeting. The writer did, however, come to a number of general conclusions which are highlighted in the following paragraphs:

> There seems to be very little diversity and distribution across the programs and activities which does not speak favorably for the coordinating agencies relating to full programs and planning. There seems to be an emphasis only in the admissions program and registration program.

> The program, Academic Services Analysis, appeared to be over-emphasized in the responses. It may be justified in that student information gathered and maintained in the other programs is often reflected under the reporting procedures of this program.

Additional implications and trends can be gleamed by comparing the number NCBP (not coordinated but planned).

> In the financial aids and registration programs, many state agencies are not requiring any type of coordinated effort, but it is in the planning stage. Much of this delay relates to lack of standardization of management information systems data bases. Institutions seem to be resisting efforts to change to common reporting formats. The demands for better accent ability and management are reflected in these program trends.

In conclusion, the data does provide a useful picture of the coordination of academic services between institutions of higher education and statewide higher education boards. On the other hand, the study has a number of shortcomings. First, the individual activities were not mutually exclusive; second, the programs may not be those represented in all Offices of Admissions and Records and in some cases, are not totally in the academic wing. Thirdly, some inconsistencies might have occurred in that different agencies defined what was meant by coordination based on their own working rules.

In spite of these shortcomings, it is hopeful that the data will be useful in allowing the session to focus on the trends and in aiding state coordinating agencies to identify those states that are moving ahead in a positive fashion relating to gathering student information.

Table of Index Codes

Table I: Enrollment Table

1. below 25,000
2. 25,000 to 49,000
3. 50,000 to 99,000
4. 100,000 to 199,000
5. 200,000 or more

Operating Budget Code

1. below $25,000
2. $25,000 to $49,000
3. $50,000 to $74,000
4. $75,000 to $99,000
5. $100,000 to $499,000
6. $500,000 or over

Tables II through IX

1. NBCV - Now being coordinated voluntarily
2. NBCM - Now being coordinated, mandatory
3. & 4. NCBP - Not being coordinated but planned
5. NC - Not coordinated

TABLE

I

Statewide Higher Education Board Data

| | | |

TABLE

II

School Relations And Student Recruitment

| | | |

TABLE
III
Admissions

| | | |

TABLE

IV

Orientation

Prospective New Student Campus Visitations	4	1	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	1	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
V - Voluntary

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
M - Mandatory

N
C - Not being Coordinated But Planned
B
P

NC - Not Coordinated

TABLE

V

Financial Aids

Statewide program for Fund Raising Student Scholarship	3	4	3	4	4		3	2	3	3	1	3	4	1	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4			3	4	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	1	4	4
Coordination of Educational Opportunity Grants	3	4	4	4	2		3	4	3	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1		2	4	4	2	4	4	1	4	4	4	1	4	4
Coodination of Guaranteed Student Loan Program	3	4	1	4	2		3	4	3	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	2	4	2	2		2	1	2	2	4	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	2
Coodination of National Defense Student Loan	3	4	4	4	2		3	4	3	3	1	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1		4	1	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	2	4	1	4	4
Supervision of a State Scholarship Program	3	4	1	4	2		4	4	3	3	3	4	4	1	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2		4	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	2
Uniform Federal Program Affairs and Fiscal Operations Report	3	4	4	4	4		3	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	4	1	4		2	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	1	4	1
Standardized Records, Accounts and File Maintenance	3	4	3	4	4		3	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	2	4	3
Regulation of Institutional Scholarship Programs	4	4	1	4	4		3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	4	4
Coordination of Student Employment Programs	4	4	4	4	4		3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
Coordination of Veterans Affairs	4	4	4	4	4		3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	1	4		4	1	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	1

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
V - Voluntary

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
M - Mandatory

NCBP - Not Being Coordinated But Planned

NC - Not Coordinated

TABLE

VI

Academic Services Analysis

	AL	AZ	AR	CA	CO	CT	DC	FL	GA	HI	ID	IL	IN	IA	KS	KY	LA	ME	MD	MA	MI	MN	MS	MO	MT	NB	NV	NH	NJ	NM	NY	NC	ND	OH	OK	OR	PA	RI	SC	SD	TN	TX	UT	VT	VA	WA	WV	WI	WY
Analyzing results of Admission Decisions (i.e., number accepted, number rejected, reason rejected, etc.)	3	2	4	3	4		3	3	2	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4		2	4	2	3	4	1	4	4	4	4	2	3	2	4
Analyzing enrollment trends (i.e., number of fulltime, part time students, number from particular states, counties, etc.)	2	2	2	3	2		3	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	2	4	2	1		2	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Analyzing utilization of space	2	2	2	2	2		3	2	2	2	3	2	4	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	2	2	2	1		2	1	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Analyzing grading practices (i.e., number of A's awarded by Department Course, etc.)	4	4	4	3	4		3	3	4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
Analyzing academic abilities and relative performance of students (i.e., relating test data and GPA, predicting GPS's)	3	2	3	4	4		3	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4		1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
Performing simulation analysis to assess the interaction effect of various institutional variables.	4	4	4	4	4		3	3	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4		1	3	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	3
Standardized student information data base	3	3	4	3	2		3	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	2	1		2	1	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	4	4	2	4	2

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
V - Voluntary

NBC - Now Being Cordinated
M - Mandatory

N
C - Not Being Coordinated But Planned
B
P

NC - Not Coordinated

TABLE
VII
Registration

Uniform academic calendar	4	2	4	4	4		3	2	2	4	3	3	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4		2	1	2	4	4	4	2	4	2	4	4	3	4	2
Statewide single fee schedule	4	2	1	4	4		4	2	1	2	4	4	1	4	2	3	4	4	1	4	4	2	4	4		2	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	2
Coordinated computer support of data input and processing	3	4	1	4	4		3	2	2	2	4	4	4	1	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4		2	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3	4	3
Uniform guidelines concerning class schedules/master timetable construction	4	3	4	4	4		3	3	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Statewide policies relating to withdrawals and refund of fees	4	4	4	4	4		4	2	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4		2	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	2
Coordination of teacher and other types of certification'	4	2	2	4	2		3	2	4	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	1		4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	2	4	3	2	4
Uniform guidelines for data security and confidentiality	4	4	4	4	4		4	2	2	2	1	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4		3	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	4
Coordination of student statistics and reports at all levels	4	4	4	4	4		3	2	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Uniform student ID cards	4	3	1	3	2		3	2	1	2	2	1	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	3	4		2	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	2	4	4	2	4	4

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
V - Voluntary

NBC - Now Being Coordinated
M - Mandatory

N
C
B
P - Not Being Coordinated But Planned

NC - Not Coordinated

TABLE
VIII
Records

| | | |

TABLE
IX
FORMER STUDENTS

| | | |

Narrative Summary of Open-ended Questions

Section IV:

Description of significant statewide system coordination of institutional academic services functions.

The Analysis of this section includes a summary of the responses of each state board of higher education to the following three questions:

1. Describe concisely the coordinated academic service function which has contributed to the efficiency of your statewide system by reducing operating costs or by holding operating costs in the face of a limited increase in resources. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted for further information on this coordination.

2. Describe concisely the coordinated academic service function which you feel has had the greatest positive impact in your statewide system without regard for cost. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted for further information on this coordination.

3. Describe concisely the most significant coordinated academic service function which you are planning for your statewide system at this time. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted concerning this planned coordination.

The name of the person to contact for further information on the coordinated academic service function described is noted when available. Finally, a short discussion highlights the most frequently mentioned and most innovative or imaginative programs.

Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama.

1. No response.
2. No response.
3. No response.

Arizona Board of Regents, Phoenix, Arizona.

1. No response.
2. No response.
3. No response.

State Board of Higher Education, Little Rock, Arkansas.

1. The State Board holds operating costs by reviewing and making recommendations on new program proposals; it also coordinates financial

requests and standardizes scholarship policies. Contact: M. Olin Cook, Director.

2. Program review and summary financial recommendations have had the greatest positive impact on the system. Contact: M. Olin Cook, Director.

3. Off-campus instruction for the State of Arkansas is being planned. Contact: Gary D. Chamberlin, Associate Director.

California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, California.

1. No response.

2. The greatest positive impact of the Council has been the development of policy and procedural recommendations to insure that all qualified first-time freshmen and transfer students have access to institutions of higher learning. These recommendations, adopted by the Council and, in some cases, by the Legislature, also provide a policy statement of priorities in the admission of new students, and offer procedures for centralizing admissions. Contact: Dorothy M. Knoell, Higher Education Specialist.

3. There are no significant coordinated academic service functions being planned at this time. Note, however, that the Coordinating Council will be replaced next year by a new Postsecondary Education Commission whose goal will be to plan to insure "wise utilization of state resources"; the PEC will probably not be concerned with the "mechanics of registration, admission and student services."

Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver, Colorado.

1. The administration of extension programs by the Commission has contributed to the efficiency of the statewide system. Contact: Dr. Keith Asplin, Director, Outreach Programs.

2. Administration of the Student Loan and Financial Aid Program has had the greatest positive impact on the Colorado system. Contact: Betty Miller, Director of Financial Aids.

3. No response.

Commission for Higher Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

1. Program development in the public sector has contributed to the efficiency of the statewide system. Contact: Dr. Louis Rabineau, Vice Chancellor.

2. No response.

3. The most significant function being planned is the incorporation of a Statewide Information System encompassing all public colleges in the State. The plan consists of a Data Base/Data Communications system with shared hardware and centrally developed software; common definitions of data elements; security of local records; supply of comparable information on all functions of the colleges (including admissions and record-keeping) to both local administration and the Commission for Higher Education. Contact: Francis J. Degnan, Director of Research.

Board of Higher Education, Washington, District of Columbia.

1. No coordinated academic services.

2. No coordinated academic services.

3. Plans exist for the establishment of the Higher Education Administrative Service Agency (HEASA) which would be responsible for all financial and personnel management functions, facilities, supplies, equipment, computer center, and other supportive services. Contact: Richard K. Fox, Chairman, Management and Budget Committee, Board of Higher Education.

State University System of Florida, Board of Regents, Tallahassee, Florida.

1. Operating costs have been reduced through the development of a common application form for all public community colleges and universities. (Soon to be added is a common transcript form). Contact: Dr. Paul C. Parker, Director, University-Wide Programs.

2. The function which has had the greatest positive impact on the Florida system has been the implementation of a Statewide Articulation Agreement between the community colleges and public universities. This has reduced conflicts and simplified the transfer process. Contact: Dr. Paul C. Parker, Director, University-Wide Programs.

3. Common course numbering and common student information systems are the most significant academic service functions being planned. The common course numbering involves public and private colleges, community colleges and universities. Contact: Dr. Michael DeCarlo, Common Course Numbering Project Director, Department of Education.

The common student information system interfaces with systems being developed in the community colleges and secondary schools. Contact: Dr. Bruce Mitchell, Director of Special Projects, State University System of Florida.

University System of Georgia. Atlanta, Georgia.

1. Costs have been held by the Regents Central Office which appropriates funds after analysis of the programs and responsibilities of each institution. Unnecessary duplication is eliminated in all areas of the system. Contact: Shealy E. McCoy, Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs and Treasurer.

2. The development of a Core Curriculum has had the greatest positive impact on the Georgia State system. Freshman and sophomore credits earned under the Core Curriculum at any institution in the University System are transferable to any other institution in the system. Contact: Haskin R. Pounds, Assistant Vice Chancellor.

3. The most significant function now being planned is the development of a Management Information System. It will specify standardized and uniform data maintenance at all units in order to provide a broad scope of information at various levels, i.e., institution, State, Federal, and non-governmental. Operational processes and maintenance of primary data will take place at the institution level. Areas included range from budgeting and fiscal accounting to student records. Contact: John D. Williams, Director, Management Information System.

University of Hawaii, Board of Regents, Honolulu, Hawaii.

1. No response.

2. The "Coordinated Admission Program" has had the greatest positive impact on the Hawaii Statewide system. It has given the system the ability to coordinate academic services and to accept as many students as possible. Contact: Dr. Peter T. Dyer, Academic Planner.

3. The most significant coordinated activity now being planned is the Statewide Financial Aids Program. Contact: Dr. Peter T. Dyer, Academic Planner.

Office of Higher Education, Boise, Idaho.

1. The State Board has recently limited new and expanded academic programs in response to recommendations by a Curriculum Committee. This Committee evaluates all new and expanded programs; new programs must be accompanied by cost projections for at least three years. Contact: Milton Small, Office of Higher Education.

2. The greatest positive impact in the Idaho statewide system has been coordinated gathering and analysis of information about the system.

This has led in turn to reduced expansion of the system and to identification of the role and mission of the institutions. Contact: Milton Small, Office of Higher Education.

3. Idaho is planning a delineation of the precise limitations to be imposed on each institution along with a requirement for precise, timely information to insure the imposed limitations. Contact: Milton Small, Office of Higher Education.

Illinois Board of Higher Education, Springfield, Illinois

1. Costs have been reduced by identifying low priority programs and then reallocating operating expenditures on the basis of priority. Contact: Steven B. Sample, Deputy Director for Programs.

2. The function with the greatest positive impact on the statewide system has been the Higher Education Cooperation Act which provides $350,000 for grants for interinstitutional cooperation among public and private institutions. Contact: Richard I. Miller, Associate Director for Programs.

3. A coordinated computer service for the state is being developed. Contact: David J. Nyman, Associate Director of Data and Management Information Systems.

Commission for Higher Education, Indianapolis, Indiana.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas.

1. Contact: Dr. Joe McFarland, Academic Officer.

2. No response.

3. Long-range physical planning is the most significant function now being planned. Contact: Warren Corman, Facilities Officer.

Council on Public Higher Education, Frankfort, Kentucky.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Louisiana Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Maryland Council for Higher Education, Annapolis, Maryland.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. Articulation agreements between public institutions are being worked out. Contact: Eugene Stanley, Interstate and Inter-Institutional Relations.

Board of Higher Education, Boston, Massachusetts.

1. No response.

2. The Board of Higher Education's power to make budget recommendations for all public higher education institutions, and degree granting authority for both public and private institutions are two functions with the greatest positive impact. Any new degree programs or charter revisions must receive the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Contact: William Bestimt, Director of Budget and Facilities Planning.

3. No response.

State Board of Education, Lansing, Michigan.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Missouri Commission on Higher Education, Jefferson City, Missouri.

1. Operating costs may be reduced in the future through an Academic Space Vacancy Study, identifying student vacancies by program for each public and private institution. Contact: John Byrd, Physical Facilities and Federal Programs.

2. The functions having the greatest positive impact statewide have been the gathering, analyzing, reporting and projecting of enrollment data and Inventory of Academic Degree and Certificate Programs. Contact: Robert W. Jacob, Director of Academic Research, Planning and Development.

3. The most significant function now in the planning stages is a uniform cost accounting system and data reporting device which will probably be completed within the next year. Contact: Donald Lindenbush, Director, Financial Affairs.

Commission of Higher Education, Helena, Montana.

1. No response.

2. Two functions with the greatest positive impact are a uniform admissions application and both counselor and student handbooks. Contact: William J. Lannon, Administrative Assistant to the C.H.E.

3. The most significant academic service functions being planned are uniform transcripts and high school counselor training and information clinics. Contact: William J. Lannon, Administrative Assistant.

New Jersey Department of Higher Education, Trenton, New Jersey.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. The most significant coordinated academic function being planned is the New Jersey Admissions System (NJAS). This system, which will be available to public and private colleges in New Jersey, specifies standard approaches (but not admissions standards) to all management systems development. It provides a statewide service (student data base, statistical reports) and computer based assistance to the admissions officer on each campus (control of increasing volume of applications, acceptances, statistical and reporting demands). Contact: Dr. Donald R. Arnold, Director of Management Systems.

Board of Educational Finance, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

University of the State of New York (New York State Education Department), Albany, New York.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

1. The functions which have reduced costs in North Carolina are operation of a State Educational Assistance Authority and coordination of the development of transfer guidelines. Contact: Dr. Harold Delaney, Vice President - Student Services and Special Programs.

2. No response.

3. Future coordination plans include a common application form (but not a common admission system), a common student health policy, and a University-wide student aid program. Contact: Dr. Harold Delaney, Vice President - Student Services and Special Programs.

North Dakota State Board of Higher Education, Bismark, North Dakota.

1. No response.

2. The coordinated function with the greatest positive impact has been the development of a data base system, Management Information System, space planning and reporting systems. Contact: Richard L. Davison, Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Research.

3. In the planning stages are articulation, student aids and data collection.

Oregon State System of Higher Education, Eugene, Oregon.

1. Contributing to the efficiency of the Oregon Statewide System has been centralized accounting. Contact: Michael Jennings, Data Systems Coordinator.

2. The function with the greatest positive impact is control of new academic program approval. Contact: Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

3. A system-wide Student Records System is presently being implemented (admission, registration, scheduling, accounting, alumni records) along with a system computer network. Contact: Michael Jennings, Data Systems Coordinator.

State Board of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

The Board of Regents for Education, Providence, Rhode Island.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. Rhode Island is planning to develop Institutional Roles and Missions for its three institutions of higher learning. It will be from the establishment of these roles that coordination of academic services functions all begin to occur. Contact: Dr. Clyde Ingle, Special Assistant for Higher Education.

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Columbia, South Carolina.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Board of Regents, South Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota.

1. Operating costs are reduced through the use of a zero base budget system which in turn is based on a computed cost analysis system. Contact: David McKenny, Associate Commissioner for Business Affairs.

2. The function which has had the greatest positive impact has been the creation of the Academic Advisory Council. This council, comprised of the Academic Dean of each institution and the Associate Commissioner, meets six times per year to advise the Commissioner's Office on matters of academic concern. Contact: Francis B. Nickerson, Associate Commissioner.

3. A Common Course Numbering system is being implemented. Work is now going forward to identify common courses by title and number, and to differentiate between similar-sounding courses which are actually different. This project has increased communication between the several campuses. Contact: Francis B. Nickerson, Associate Commissioner.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Nashville, Tennessee.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Texas.

1. The development of a formula system of adequate distribution of state funds for state programs has contributed to the efficiency of the statewide system. Contact: Division of Fiscal Planning.

2. The coordination of program development among state institutions has had the greatest positive impact on the statewide system. Contact: Dr. David T. Kelly, Head, Division of Program Development.

3. The most significant academic service function being planned is an educational data center which will coordinate the collection and analysis of data concerning Texas higher education. Contact: Winston L. Cave, Director, Educational Data Center.

Utah State Board of Higher Education, Salt Lake City, Utah.

1. No response.

2. Statewide control of institutional roles, curricula, degrees conferred, and new programs has had positive impact on the system. Contact: Dr. Leon R. McCarrey, Associate Commissioner and Director of Academic Affairs.

3. No response.

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. The most significant coordinated service function that is being planned and implemented is a State Plan for Regional Consortia for the coordination of continuing education in Virginia. The objective of the Plan is to provide adequate opportunities for the continuing education of the adult population of the Commonwealth. This includes efforts for maximum economy compatible with maintenance of quality and optimum utilization of facilities and expertise in State-supported institutions of higher education. Institutions will be encouraged to provide baccalaureate and master's degree programs on a non-traditional basis through inter-institutional effort. Contact: James C. Phillips, Continuing Education Administration.

Council on Higher Education, Olympia, Washington.

1. No response.

2. The function with the greatest positive impact has been the effort to facilitate transfer of credits, especially between two and four-year institutions. Contact: E. Anne Winchester, Deputy Coordinator.

3. No response.

West Virginia Board of Regents, Charleston, West Virginia.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

University of Wisconsin System, Madison, Wisconsin.

1. No response.

2. No response.

3. No response.

Summary

In terms of measures used for holding costs, those most frequently mentioned were control over new and expanding programs, power to review the roles of each institution in relation to the system as a whole, and power over allocation of funds, be it through uniform cost accounting, budget recommendations, or actual budget allocations.

The function mentioned most often as having the most significant positive impact on the statewide system was the introduction of articulation agreements or some form of cooperation which facilitated the transfer of students into the system, or between systems. In some cases, articulation is a service performed only for the public institutions; in others, it is performed for both the public and private institutions. Also mentioned as positive coordinating functions were review of the roles of the individual institutions in relation to the statewide system, authority to approve new and expanding programs, and authority to grant degrees.

In the planning area, expanded data processing and information systems were planned by over 39 percent of the states responding -- the largest consensus of any of the programs mentioned. The type of system planned ranges from system-wide data processing to some data base standardization with varying capabilities. Also being planned by many institutions is statewide standardization of financial aid and admissions applications (though not necessarily admissions requirements). Other programs mentioned were common course numbering, articulation agreements, standard transcripts, a common health policy, and maximum facility utilization review.

Among the more innovative or unusual programs is an extensive plan to facilitate continuing adult education in Virginia. Also unusual is the statewide Core Curriculum in Georgia, which if taken by freshman or sophomore students, transfers to any other public institution.

Section V
Appendix

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS

AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

Survey of the voluntary and/or mandatory coordination of academic services (admission, registration and records) between institutions of higher education and statewide higher education boards.

1973-74

Sponsored by the Institutional Studies and Operational Analysis Committee of the Data Management and Research Group.

The survey instrument has been designed with particular care to insure accuracy and ease of response. Though the instrument may at first appear to be rather long, you will find the responses require only a check or quick numerical entry, with the exception of the last page, which has provisions for open-ended questions.

Only one copy of the instrument has been mailed to each statewide higher education board; but where it is appropriate and desirable to do so, provision has been made for separate responses by the Chief Executive Officer and other appropriate staff. For one or two questions, you may want to consult your institutional research personnel.

After you have completed the instrument, staple it together in the three places designated and place it in the mail immediately. Please note that return postage has already been provided. Return the instrument no later than November 9, 1973.

SECTION I -- STATEWIDE HIGHER EDUCATION BOARD DATA

1. Identification information relating to statewide board of higher education:

   A. Name: _____

   B. Address: _____
   Street

   _____
   City State Zip

2. Number of higher education board professional staff

   A. ☐ Less than 5

   B. ☐ 5 - 9

   C. ☐ 10 - 19

   D. ☐ 20 or over

3. Number of higher education institutions governed

	Public		Private	
A.	_____	Community Colleges	_____	Community Colleges
B.	_____	Four Year Colleges	_____	Four Year Colleges
C.	_____	Upper Division Institutions	_____	Upper Division Institutions
D.	_____	Universities	_____	Universities

4. Statewide enrollment for 1973 fall term to nearest thousand (headcount)

   A. ☐ Below 25,000 C. ☐ 50,000 to 99,000

   B. ☐ 25,000 to 49,000 D. ☐ 100,000 to 199,000

   E. ☐ 200,000 or more

5. Statewide operating budget for FY 1974

A.	_____	Below 25,000	D.	_____	75,000 to 99,000
B.	_____	25,000 to 49,000	E.	_____	100,000 to 499,000
C.	_____	50,000 to 74,000	F.	_____	500,000 or over

6. Name and title of staff member primarily concerned with statewide coordination of academic services (admissions, registration and records)

SECTION II -- STATEWIDE COORDINATION OF ACADEMIC SERVICES

Please indicate how the statewide higher education board or office coordinates academic services between and/or among institutions of higher education by following these instructions:

(1) If the activity listed is "not coordinated" or "not coordinated but planned," check the appropriate box under these headings.

(2) If an activity is "now coordinated," indicate if the coordination is voluntary or mandatory. If the coordination is voluntary, you would check the top half of the box for any activity "now coordinated." If the coordination is mandatory, you would check the bottom half of the box.

School Relations and Student Recruiting

	Now Being Coordinated	Not Coordinated But Planned	Not Coordinated
1. High school, community college and university counselors meetings	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Scheduling of college day and nights	☐	☐	☐
3. Development of admissions timetable	☐	☐	☐
4. Institutional bulletins and recruitment materials	☐	☐	☐

Admissions

1. Uniform application for admission	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Uniform admission requirements	☐	☐	☐
3. Uniform residence requirements	☐	☐	☐
4. Disseminate housing information for students	☐	☐	☐
5. Uniform student health requirements	☐	☐	☐
6. Transfer credit evaluation	☐	☐	☐
7. Administration of standardized testing	☐	☐	☐

	Now Being Coordinated		Not Coordinated But Planned	Not Coordinated
Orientation				
1. Prospective New Student Campus Visitations	☐	Voluntary	☐	☐
	☐	Mandatory		
Financial Aids				
1. Statewide program for Fund Raising Student Scholarship and Loan Funds	☐	Voluntary	☐	☐
	☐	Mandatory		
2. Coordination of Educational Opportunity Grants	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
3. Coordination of Guaranteed Student Loan Program	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
4. Coordination of National Defense Student Loan	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
5. Supervision of a State Scholarship Program	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
6. Uniform Federal Program Affairs and Fiscal Operations Report	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
7. Standardized Records, Accounts and File Maintenance	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
8. Regulation of Institutional Scholarship Programs	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
9. Coordination of Student Employment Programs	☐		☐	☐
	☐			
10. Coordination of Veterans Affairs	☐		☐	☐
	☐			

Academic Services Analysis

	Now Being Coordinated	Not Coordinated But Planned	Not Coordinated
1. Analyzing results of Admission Decisions (i.e., number accepted, number rejected, reason rejected, etc.)	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Analyzing enrollment trends (i.e., number of full time, part time students, number from particular states, counties, etc.)	☐ ☐	☐	☐
3. Analyzing utilization of space	☐ ☐	☐	☐
4. Analyzing grading practices (i.e., number of A's awarded by Department and Course, etc.)	☐ ☐	☐	☐
5. Analyzing academic abilities and relative performance of students (i.e., relating test data and GPA, predicting GPA's)	☐ ☐	☐	☐
6. Performing simulation analysis to assess the interaction effect of various institutional variables.	☐ ☐	☐	☐
7. Standardized student information data base	☐ ☐	☐	☐

Registration

	Now Being Coordinated	Not Coordinated But Planned	Not Coordinated
1. Uniform academic calendar	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Statewide single fee schedule	☐	☐	☐
3. Coordinated computer support of data input and processing	☐	☐	☐
4. Uniform guidelines concerning class schedules/master timetable construction	☐	☐	☐
5. Statewide policies relating to withdrawals and refund of fees	☐	☐	☐
6. Coordination of teacher and other types of certification	☐	☐	☐
7. Uniform guidelines for data security and confidentiality	☐	☐	☐
8. Uniform student ID cards	☐	☐	☐
9. Coordination of student statistics and reports at all levels	☐	☐	☐

Records

1. Uniform format for permanent academic records and transcripts	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Statewide regulations concerning probation and scholastic retention	☐	☐	☐

Records (continued)

	Now Being Coordinated	Not Coordinated But Planned	Not Coordinated
3. Uniform calendar for commencement	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
4. Standardized grading systems	☐	☐	☐

Former Student and Continuing Relations

1. Administration of employment placement and career advisement	☐ Voluntary ☐ Mandatory	☐	☐
2. Public relations and public information program	☐	☐	☐
3. Coordination of ceremonies and special events	☐	☐	☐
4. Development of alumni relations	☐	☐	☐
5. Regulation of development and foundation roles	☐	☐	☐

SECTION III - DESCRIPTION OF SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE SYSTEM COORDINATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC SERVICES FUNCTIONS

Note: Response to the questions in this section will necessarily involve statewide system judgements concerning significant coordination. Please report only one activity for each question.

1. Describe concisely the coordinated academic service function which has contributed to the efficiency of your statewide system by reducing operating costs or by holding operating costs in the face of a limited increase in resources. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted for further information on this coordination.

Name of Person to Contact: _____

Title: _____

2. Describe concisely the coordinated academic service function which you feel has had the greatest positive impact in your statewide system without regard for cost. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted for further information on this coordination.

Name of Person to Contact: _____

Title: _____

3. Describe concisely the most significant coordinated academic service function which you are planning for your statewide system at this time. Give the name and title of the person who might be contacted concerning this planned coordination.

Name of Person to Contact: _____

Title: _____

This completes the survey instrument. Please take the following steps:

1. Indicate the person primarily responsible for completion of the instrument by printing full name here:

_____

LAST MIDDLE FIRST

2. Staple the instrument together in the three places designated on the back cover and place in return mail. As you can see, return postage has been provided; and the back cover serves as the mailing cover.